		1	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK		
2	ENOTE IN TOTAL		
3	X		
4	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, :	05 CR 400	
5	:		
6	-against- :		
7		United States Courthouse Brooklyn, New York	
8	SERGE EDOUARD, :	• ,	
9	Defendant. :	February 9, 2010 4:30 o'clock p.m.	
10	X	·	
11			
12	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE SANDRA L. TOWNES		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
14	APPEARANCES:		
15			
16		A NYIENDO	
17	271	ssistant United States Attorney '1 Cadman Plaza East	
18 19	ВГОО	klyn, New York	
20	For the Defendant: DAVI	D MACEY, ESQ.	
21			
22		Rudolph Cadman Plaza East	
23	Broo	klyn, New York ) 613-2538	
24			
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.		

```
2
1
              THE CLERK: Please raise your right hand.
 2
               (The interpreter is duly sworn by the clerk. He is
    Yves Pierre.)
 3
 4
              MR. MACEY: Judge, for some legal words, the
    defendant could use the interpreter.
5
 6
              THE COURT: All right.
7
                          Criminal case for sentencing, docket
              THE CLERK:
8
    number 05 CR 400, the United States of America versus Serge
9
    Edouard.
10
              Counsel, please state your names for the record.
              MS. NYIENDO: Good afternoon, Your Honor.
11
12
              Licha Nyiendo for the United States, standing in for
13
    Walter Norkin.
14
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
              MR. MACEY: Good afternoon, Judge.
15
16
              David Macey on behalf of Mr. Edouard, who is
17
    present.
18
              THE COURT: Good afternoon.
19
              Be seated, please.
20
              THE INTERPRETER: Yves Pierre, official court
21
    interpreter.
22
              THE COURT:
                          The interpreter has been sworn.
23
              Mr. Edouard pled guilty to conspiracy to import five
24
    kilograms or more of cocaine, a Class A felony. He pled
25
    guilty before then Magistrate Judge Matsumoto of this Court,
```

who is now a district judge, but he pled guilty on February 25, 2008, in this court.

I have had an opportunity to review the presentence investigation report. After reviewing that report it is the finding of the Court that Mr. Edouard acted voluntarily in pleading guilty, that he fully understood his rights and the consequences of his plea, and that there is a factual basis for the plea, which I am satisfied he understood the charge and, as I said, voluntarily pled guilty to it.

I therefore accept the plea of guilty to conspiracy to import five kilograms or more of cocaine.

Now, I want to mention for the record, so you can let me know if I have missed anything, everything that I have reviewed.

I have reviewed the presentence -- I'm sorry -- the plea agreement. I have also reviewed the October 13, 2008, letter from Mr. Macey, in which the defendant objects to certain portions of the presentence investigation report; the December 3, 2009, sentencing letter regarding the defendant's motion for downward departure pursuant to United States sentencing guideline Section 5K2.0, and attached to that, at least in the form that I have it, there are letters and I have read letters from the defendant's family and friends and also letters attached to a letter dated December 15, 2009, offered as evidence of the defendant's good character and these are

letters from municipal authorities.

In addition, I have received and reviewed a June 18, 2009, letter from the government and in that letter Mr. D'Allesandro, at that time the person prosecuting this case indicates that he believes that matters involved in the objections to the presentence report may be resolved without the need for a hearing.

I have also received and reviewed the letter dated December 7, 2009, from Mr. Norkin, and this letter shows me that we do need a hearing with regard to the role adjustment in the presentence report. In the last paragraph the defendant claims that no upward role adjustment is applicable contrary to the guidelines calculation in the PSR, which finds that an adjustment of three points is applicable.

The government respectfully submits that an upward adjustment of two points is applicable.

The defendant argues that there should be no points for role adjustment and, according to Mr. Norkin, this is consistent with the plea agreement.

Why don't we do this. Let's first go
through -- because I don't agree with what the government says
entirely, so I am going to rule on these objections to the
presentence investigation report.

MR. MACEY: Judge, I don't know if it would clarify the matter, but we agree with the December 7, 2009, letter of

5 Mr. Norkin. 1 2 THE COURT: You do? 3 MR. MACEY: We do, yes. 4 We agree with all the positions that he raises in there. We are in complete agreement. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. I didn't get anything 7 saying that from you. 8 MR. MACEY: I apologize. We had kind of a last 9 minute agreement, Mr. Norkin and I, regarding the 10 clarification of these different things when we were not going 11 to be disputing their assertions. In fact, we concur. 12 THE COURT: Then there is one assertion -- so that 13 you agree that the total offense level is 37 instead of 38? 14 MR. MACEY: Yes, Judge. All right. Let's look back at the 15 THE COURT: 16 presentence investigation report in the calculations. 17 I am going to amend that report. I am going to 18 amend it, except I am looking for the presentence report. 19 Here it is. 20 MS. NYIENDO: Your Honor, there were also two 21 addendums to the PSR. I didn't hear Your Honor mention them. 22 THE COURT: Yes, that is correct. I didn't mention 23 them but I have received and reviewed the presentence 24 investigation report, the addendum to the presentence investigation report, and the second addendum to the 25

6 1 presentence investigation report. 2 Is there anything else that I have not reviewed? MS. NYIENDO: I don't think so. 3 4 MR. MACEY: On behalf of the defense, I believe that's a complete history. 5 6 THE COURT: All right. Let's look at the objections 7 to the presentence report. 8 There is one that the government agrees with. I do 9 not. So I must rule on that. It has to do with the 10 defendant's criminal history category. 11 Excuse me. I have to go through this. 12 planned to just go through each one. 13 Paragraph ten of the objections to the presentence 14 investigation report, as to paragraph 37 based on the above, 15 the defendant objects to the calculation of the total criminal 16 history points as five and the criminal history category of 17 three. 18 All right. The change, even before I get to this, 19 paragraph five, where the defendant objected to the leadership 20 enhancement, the three levels, I am assuming that the 21 government agrees, that they could not prove by a 22 preponderance of the evidence that the defendant supervised, 23 that this criminal conspiracy involved five people, and that 24 he was a supervisor. The government has argued that it should 25 be a two-level enhancement, which would mean that he was a

supervisor but the conspiracy did not involve five people.

So that I am amending in the presentence report, on page six, paragraph 17, adjustment for role in the offense is amended from three to two; and paragraph 19, the adjusted offense level is 40; paragraph 20, after the adjustment for acceptance of responsibility, the total offense level in the defendant's case is 37.

Now, with regard to the objections in 36, paragraphs 36 and 37, the two-level or the two points added, the defendant committed the instant offense less than two years after release from imprisonment for the sentence imposed on July 22, 1998.

That is true. It is based upon his -- I am basing it upon his testimony under oath when he entered his plea of guilty. I am looking at the transcript on page 25 of the plea, lines 15 and 16. The defendant -- well, maybe I should start at line 12.

"The Court: All right. Mr. Edouard, I would like you to state, in your own words, what you did in connection with the acts charged in Count One of the indictment.

The defendant: I was involved from my country, from Haiti, sent some drugs to the United States.

The Court: Did you make an agreement with people to bring drugs from your country to the United States?

The defendant: Yes, I did.

8 1 Did you knowingly and intentionally make The Court: 2 that agreement, knowing that it was not legal? 3 The defendant: Yes, I did. Yes, I did. The Court: Can you tell me approximately when you 4 engaged in this activity, this agreement, to bring drugs to 5 the United States?" 6 7 Go to page 26: 8 "The defendant: I started like a long time ago, 9 since 1996. But after like 1998, I went back home. I stayed 10 home and I started sending drugs to the United States. 11 Court: Well, the indictment charges that you were 12 engaged in this activity between January 2000 and October 25, 13 2000. 14 Are those dates accurate? Sir? 15 The defendant: Yes, yes, that's accurate." 16 So it is based upon those statements, and I guess I should go down because I know there is a Florida case and 17 18 there is a New York case, but lines 15 through 22 on page 26: 19 "Mr. Petruzzi: I think the point in question would 20 be where the drugs were being transported to. 21 The Court: Were they going to be imported into the 22 United States at some point? 23 The defendant: It was coming from the airport, from 24 Haiti to the airport JFK. The Court: JFK in Queens? 25

```
9
1
              The defendant: Yes."
 2
              Based upon that I do find that the defendant's
 3
    criminal history category is correct in the presentence
 4
    investigation report.
              Is there anything else that we need to discuss
5
 6
    before we actually get to the sentencing?
7
              MR. MACEY: We have a 5K2 request.
8
              THE COURT: Yes. I know you do.
9
              I think I -- did I mention that? I think I did.
10
    That's in your December 9th --
11
              MR. MACEY:
                          December 3rd.
12
              THE COURT:
                          No. Yes, the December 3rd letter.
13
              Anything else?
14
              MR. MACEY: In terms of the calculation?
    have any other -- anything further in terms of calculation.
15
16
              THE COURT: All right. Is there anything that you
17
    would like to say for the record?
18
              MR. MACEY:
                          Yes.
19
              May I address the 5K2?
20
              THE COURT: To the calculation?
21
              MR. MACEY: To the calculation, I believe, Judge, we
22
    are in agreement. It is a level 37?
23
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
24
              MR. MACEY: And we would object in terms of the
25
    category. My only response to the Court's -- I understand the
```

```
10
    Court's position was one mention of the word, approximately,
1
 2
    describing the transcript.
 3
              THE COURT:
                          No. He said, the dates in the
 4
    indictment are accurate and that includes a period of time --
              MR. MACEY:
5
                          I agree.
 6
              It was everybody's I think intention, nobody knew
7
    exactly when this particular conspiracy started.
8
              THE COURT: You know what, your client seems to say
9
    it started in 1998. I am looking at the time period in the
10
    indictment.
11
                          We understand. We respect that.
              MR. MACEY:
12
              THE COURT:
                          All right.
13
              MR. MACEY:
                          We are at a criminal history Category 3
14
    and a level 37.
15
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
16
              MR. MACEY:
                          My only point would be to -- to argue
17
    5K2 or to explain it.
18
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
19
              MR. MACEY:
                          Would you like me to do that now?
20
              THE COURT:
                          Yes.
21
              MR. MACEY: As the Court might be aware, this case
22
    has been going on for sometime. I think it's over two years
23
    now.
          I have been traveling back and forth from Miami in
24
    numerous debriefings with Mr. Edouard involving I think every
25
    law enforcement agency in the federal government and some
```

state and locals.

He's -- I think we have done in excess of over a dozen debriefings. I don't know how many hours. We have provided enormous amount of information to the government.

I am not able at this point to share everything and the reason being, Judge, that we have an agreement with the United States Attorney's Office that should Mr. Edouard qualify for a Rule 35 in the Southern District of Florida, they would take that information and they would use it in his district and Mr. Norkin wanted me to be very clear not to say anything that would be used towards the Southern District in terms of my 5K2.

I just wanted to preface everything I say, that there is a lot more to Mr. Edouard's cooperation. But looking strictly in terms of what he's done in New York, I just wanted to point out a couple of different things.

The first being, the case of Reginald Fleumont.

Mr. Fleumont was a fugitive from this district in Haiti.

Mr. Edouard provided information to his wife who was -- which the information was relayed to a DEA agent down in 
Port Au Prince Haiti. They identified the exact location of 
Mr. Fleumont. They captured Mr. Fleumont and he was brought 
back to the Eastern District of New York as a direct result of 
Mr. Edouard's information.

In addition, Mr. Edouard provided extensive

information about the relationship Mr. Edouard had with Mr. Fleumont, identifying all of his different tactics involving money laundering and drug trafficking and I believe he was quite valuable in terms of the identification, the capture and the ultimate conviction of Mr. Fleumont.

As I point out in my letter, if we can get outside of the -- the recognized exceptions for 5K1 and get into a heartland departure involving helping the Court identify the fugitives and capturing and bringing them to justice, I believe that this is an appropriate means for the Court to consider a departure, in addition to the countless hours of information that Mr. Edouard provided as strictly to the New York defendants and New York cases.

The other case -- actually a case that's still ongoing, Mr. Edouard, the request of Mr. Norkin is going to remain here in Brooklyn, so that he could continue his efforts with a cellmate that he is going to be providing some information for. That investigation is ongoing.

THE COURT: You may want to wait to have him sentenced if that's the case. Because I am not going to consider anything that's ongoing.

MR. MACEY: We will retract anything that's ongoing and we will ask that the Court just consider Mr. Fleumont and we will be comfortable with the agreement that we have with the United States Attorney's Office regarding the Rule 35 and

13 we will hope to see Judge Townes on another day on that matter 1 2 and provide a full picture of Mr. Edouard. 3 THE COURT: Would you like to be heard? 4 MS. NYIENDO: Pursuant to our letter of December 7, 2009, the government does not object to this Court 5 6 taking into consideration under 5K2 any assistance the 7 defendant has provided to the government. 8 THE COURT: All right. Would you like to be heard, Mr. Edouard? 9 10 THE DEFENDANT: I am really sorry for the American 11 I am also sorry for my family, the pain that I caused 12 It was not the right thing to do. Always in my mind to 13 make something better for my kid. I didn't have, but it 14 wasn't the right thing to do. 15 I really understand what life is really about. I am 16 just asking for mercy. 17 My wife, who is not here today, the fact the thing 18 that happened in Haiti, she cannot be here today. She would 19 be here right now. I put so much pain to these people but I 20 don't think anything worth for me to bring that suffering to 21 my family. I think I learned my lesson. 22 Thank you very much. 23 MR. MACEY: Judge, may I make a statement on 24 Mr. Edouard's behalf? 25 THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MACEY: I was told that the procedure is to remain seated?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. MACEY: Judge, I have had an opportunity in federal court somewhat unique to have represented Mr. Edouard for a number of years and I have seen Mr. Edouard really evolve into the man that he is standing before the Court or sitting before the Court today. He is -- his heart and his spirit really is larger than life.

I've gotten calls from -- from countless family members and friends and supporters from Haiti, talking about Mr. Edouard's generosity and his -- just his need to help.

He's -- I've gotten phone calls from principals in schools in Haiti, orphanages, teachers, just people that he's provided medical treatment to and stuff like that. He really -- he's special in that way, that he wants to help.

He's never been a violent man. He made a major mistake in his life in terms of committing this crime, which is completely egregious. He understands that. The suffering that he has put his family through, I have seen the devastation that it's had on his family and Mr. Edouard, he's cried a lot of times in our conferences about the pain that he's putting his family through.

We have had a number of sentences and we've had a lot of people fly up from Haiti to support Mr. Edouard. He

really has a really tremendous network of people. I just want -- some of his brothers and sisters are here today to support him. It's really touching to see the love and the support that he has from his family. I think that that's a tribute to the man that he is and to the man that he will become.

I ask that the Court sentence him to the bottom of the guidelines and with the caveat that we hope we will be here one day again.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I have considered all of the documents which I have listed for the record. I have considered that statutorily the maximum sentence that can be imposed is life, minimum sentence ten years. In addition, I have reviewed the advisory guideline range, total offense level is 37, criminal history category three. The imprisonment range is 262 to 327 months. The supervised release range is at least five years. The fine range is 20,000 to \$4 million.

You have indicated that your client is unable to pay a fine. I will hear you right now on that.

MR. MACEY: Judge, I have been coming here at my own expense. He had a home that was the source -- he was renting -- the source to support his legal endeavors. That home was taken away. He has no money. He has no money in his

commissary. There is no money for his lawyer. The devastation in Haiti has smashed his house. His family has been displaced. They are in the mountains, the countryside now, with friends. There is just a complete and utter financial disaster.

I would ask that the Court waive the fine.

THE COURT: I thought he had property in the Dominican Republic.

MR. MACEY: We are actively involved in -- he had property in the Dominican Republic. It was taken from him. We are working with the US Attorney's Office in the Southern District of Florida. The person that has that title, we believe it should be given to the United States Government and Mr. Edouard is actively trying to get that person to turn it over to the government. He doesn't receive any income as a result of that property, nor is he entitled to it.

THE COURT: All right. In addition, I have considered the factors pursuant to 18 USC, 3553(a) and considered the nature and circumstances of this offense.

It is very serious. The enormity of the crime including the length or duration of the conspiracy, I agree, is completely egregious.

I have also considered the history and characteristics of the defendant.

Frankly, I might believe that Mr. Edouard is sorry

and he won't do it again if he had not already been convicted of attempted criminal sale of a controlled substance in the third degree and given a sentence that was not excessive, very low. He was given a great break in that case. That was in 1993, and I have considered other convictions that he has had since that time.

I have also considered the things that you have told me in the letters that I have received about his good works.

It is the Court's determination that the sentence imposed should reflect the seriousness of the offense to which the defendant pled guilty, to reflect or promote respect for the law, and provide punishment, which I think he so richly deserves.

You know, it is not as though Mr. Edouard stepped in to the criminal arena for a very short time. It appears to this Court that he has been involved, just based on his statements at the time that he entered his plea of guilty and looking back at his criminal history.

Also I am of the opinion that my sentence should promote deterrence, both general and specific deterrence, and so, therefore, taking into consideration his cooperation and the information that he has provided, I am not going to sentence Mr. Edouard outside of the advisory guideline range or downwardly depart. Rather, I am sentencing Mr. Edouard to the lowest end of the advisory guideline range, which is

262 months in the custody of the Attorney General, to be served concurrently with the undischarged term of imprisonment in the Southern District of Florida.

I have also taken into consideration the statements made regarding his ability to pay a fine, and the fine is waived.

The sentence of imprisonment is to be followed by supervised release for a period of five years, with the following special conditions:

The defendant shall participate in an outpatient and/or inpatient drug treatment or detoxification program approved by the Probation Department.

He shall pay the costs of such treatment and/or detoxification to the degree he is reasonably able and shall cooperate in securing any applicable third-party payment.

The defendant shall disclose all financial information and documents to the Probation Department to assess his ability to pay.

The defendant shall not consume any alcohol or other intoxicants during and after treatment and/or detoxification, unless granted a prescription by a licensed physician and proof of same is provided to the Probation Department.

The defendant shall submit to testing during and after treatment to ensure abstinence from drugs and alcohol.

The defendant shall not possess a firearm,

```
19
    ammunition or destructive device.
1
 2
              With regard to the forfeiture obligation, it
 3
    confuses me a little. I think he has already paid $30,000
 4
    which was agreed to in the plea agreement.
                          Yes, Judge. That's been satisfied.
5
              MR. MACEY:
              THE COURT: Is the government satisfied with that?
 6
7
              MS. NYIENDO: We are.
8
              THE COURT: As far as forfeiture?
9
              MS. NYIENDO: Yes, we are.
10
              THE COURT: Okay. If he is deported or removed, the
    defendant shall not reenter the United States illegally.
11
12
              There is a $100 special assessment.
13
              There is a remaining count which is open. I think a
    Count Two?
14
15
              MS. NYIENDO: Yes.
16
              At this time the government moves to dismiss the
17
    remaining count in the indictment as to the defendant.
18
              THE COURT: That motion is granted. That second
    count is dismissed.
19
20
              There is a $100 -- did I say that -- special
    assessment, which is due and payable as a result of his plea
21
22
    to a felony in this court.
23
              If Mr. Edouard wishes to appeal, he must file a
24
    notice with the Court within ten days from today's date.
25
              Thank you.
```

```
20
                           I just wanted to ask, if the Court could
1
              MR. MACEY:
 2
    recommend a northeastern facility so his family could have
3
    contact.
              THE COURT: Yes. As long as he understands there is
 4
    just a recommendation on the Court's part, that it is the
5
6
    Bureau of Prisons that determines the facility in which he
    will be housed.
7
8
              MR. MACEY: He understands that.
9
              Thank you, Judge.
              THE COURT: Thank you.
10
11
               (Matter concludes.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```